

REMARKS

The final Office Action of 7 January 2008 has been received and its contents carefully studied. Reconsideration of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

The independent claims are claims 1, 11, 19, 22, and 33. All of these independent claims stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) from *Blow* (WO 99/53621).

The independent claims are now amended to clarify that the interface between the electronic device and the accessory device is configured for making the library available to the electronic device during operation of the electronic device, directly and without downloading from the accessory device. This amendment introduces no new matter and is fully supported by the specification as originally filed. For example, see the paragraph beginning at page 11, line 34 of the present application as originally filed.

At page 12 of the final Office Action, it is stated that when the accessory device is connected with the mobile station, but the power is off, no downloading occurs, i.e. the library is stored in the accessory device and it is ready for downloading. The final Office Action also said: "If the applicant means anything more, this has to be brought into the claims." Therefore, amended claim 1 now clarifies that the interface makes the library available to the electronic device directly and without downloading, even when the electronic device is in operation.

Applicant respectfully submits that configuring the interface for making the library available to the electronic device during operation of the electronic device directly from the accessory device, without downloading the library from the accessory device, is not obvious to a skilled person familiar with the *Blow* reference.

The *Blow* reference merely discloses "download of the accessory interface software code from accessory interface memory 118 in external accessory 102 to interface upload

memory 106 in mobile station 100" (see *Blow* page 6, lines 26-30). In contrast, the present claimed invention is arranged so that no downloading is needed.

Blow teaches that after a successful download of the accessory interface software code from the accessory interface memory of the external accessory to the interface upload memory in the mobile station, the mobile station controller begins to execute the instructions contained in the accessory interface software. It is therefore clear that the accessory interface software is first downloaded to the mobile station of *Blow*, and then executed from the memory of the mobile station. That software of *Blow* is not accessible as if it were installed on the electronic device; rather, it is downloaded to the electronic device.

Additionally, Applicant adds a new claim 37. No new matter is added, and new claim 37 is fully supported at least by pages 10 and 12 of the application as originally filed, as well as by originally filed claim 15. The claimed platform may, for example, be a JAVA platform which is a well-known programming language that derives much of its syntax from C and C++. Regardless of the specific type of platform, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose any of the features described in new dependent claim 37.

CONCLUSION

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of 7 January 2008 having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-20 and 22-36, as amended, to issue is earnestly solicited. It is requested that the Examiner please contact the undersigned by telephone to set up an appointment for an Examiner's Interview to discuss the foregoing comments, if there is still any doubt about the patentability of the present claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Hyman
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 45,858

mbh
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe CT 06468
Tel: (203) 261-1234
Fax: (203) 261-5676